



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,389	12/06/2000	Hiroshi Kajiwara	862.C2070	7430
5514	7590	07/28/2004	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			TRAN, PHUOC	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/730,389	KAJIWARA ET AL
Examiner	Art Unit	
Phuoc Tran	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8, 13 and 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 9-12 and 15 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/6/01 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

1. Applicants' election of species of embodiment 3 readable on claims 9-12, 15 in the reply filed on 4/26/04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. Claims 1-8, 13-14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/26/04.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aono et al [WO 98/54903].

As to claim 9, Aono et al disclose an image processing apparatus comprising: discrete wavelet transform means for performing discrete wavelet transform on respective plural components constructing image data (Fig. 7, item 101, Fig. 9; page 7, lines 5-10;); coefficient coding means for encoding coefficients of subbands generated by said discrete wavelet transform means (Fig. 7, item 102; page 7, lines 10-11); and code data generation means for generating code data by arraying code data corresponding to said respective plural components encoded by said coefficient coding means (Fig. 7, items 104, 103; page 7, line 12 – page 8, line 6; Figs., 9-

14) wherein said discrete wavelet transform means decomposes said respective plural components into different numbers of subbands for at least two components, and wherein said code data generation means generates the code data by arraying a part or whole of code data of subbands at the same level among the code data corresponding to said respective plural components (Figs. 21, 22; pages 55-56; i.e., different numbers of subbands are decomposed for Luminance, Y, and chrominance, U,V, components).

As to claim 10, Aono et al further disclose that the plural components constructing said image data includes a luminance component and a chrominance component, and the number of applications of discrete wavelet transform by said discrete wavelet transform means for said chrominance components is larger than that for said luminance component (Figs. 9, 21, 22; i.e. two chrominance components U, V are decomposed into subbands while only a luminance component is decomposed into subbands).

Claims 11-12 are simply directed to a method corresponding the apparatus of claims 9-10. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aono et al [WO 98/54903].

Claim 15 is simply directed to a computer storage medium containing a program for execution of the image processing corresponding to claims 9, 11. Although Aono et al do not expressly disclose such storage medium, implementing such software program would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is simply an obvious routine software design.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Newman, Sodagar et al, Andrew et al, and Kajiwara et al disclose the state of the art of image processing.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4861. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo H Boudreau can be reached on (703) 305-4760. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

